

REMARKS

This document relates to issues raised in the examiner's office action mailed 10/15/2007. In that office action, claims 1-28 were rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 35 U.S.C. § 103. Primary references used by the examiner in rejecting the claims are Milic-Frayling et al. (Patent Number 6,968,332 hereinafter Milic) and Soulanille et al. (Patent Number 7,110,993 hereinafter Soulanille).

Claims 1-43 have been cancelled from the application, and new claims 44-150 have been substituted therefore. No new matter has been added. It is to be noted that claims 1-83 have not been canceled for purposes relating to patentability. Rather, claims 44-150 are being substituted for claims 1-43 for purposes of clarification, and in order to present to the examiner a clean set of claims which reflect all of the presently presented claim features.

The rejections asserted by the examiner in the 10/15/2007 office action are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

It is believed that the cited prior art references of record fail to teach or suggests the combination of features as defined, for example, in claims 44-150. For example, neither Milic nor Soulanille appear to teach or suggest (either singly or in combination), the combination of features as defined, for example, in claim 44 of the present application including, for example: identifying campaign information which includes identified keywords, the campaign information being provided by an entity other than the end user of the client system; selecting, using the campaign information, specific original content of the first portion of content of the first document to be converted to one or more links to one or more uniform resource locators (URLs), the specific original content including one or more words of text matching at least one keyword from the campaign information; performing markup operations on a first portion of specific original content to thereby convert the first portion of specific original content into a first link to a first URL, the first link including a first portion of marked up content; displaying the first link at the client system, wherein the display of the first link includes display of the first portion of marked up content; detecting an occurrence of a first event associated with a location of a cursor at the client system being positioned over a portion of the displayed first link; and automatically displaying, in response to detection of the first event, a first overlay advertising impression at the client system, the first overlay advertising impression including advertising information comprising a second portion of displayed content which is different from the first portion of displayed marked up content.

In the office action, the Examiner cited column 8, lines 1-44 of Milic as disclosing “generating campaign information files which include the selected keywords”. However, this passage relates to methods for responding to a user’s request for information. For example, as stated in Milic column 7, lines 61-67:

The user specifies the information need 205 to information highlighting facility 210 directly or indirectly by communicating it to the Web information providing service 212. The system or the user may also provide information on a task that the user is currently performing. The user also specifies the type of information highlighting facility analysis that should be performed on the accessed documents.

According to the teachings of Milic, the information highlighting facility of Milic provides features to “enhance or highlight” documents based on the user’s request, which, for example, may include “terminology highlighting, document scrolling, entity extraction and relation finding, hyperlink analysis, document relevance ranking, document thumbnails, and document summarization.” (see, e.g., Milic 8:15-20)

However, as noted previously, this passage of Milic does not appear to teach or suggest each of the combination of features as defined, for example, in claim 44 of the present application.

Moreover, there appears to be no teaching, suggestion or motivation in Milic for providing functionality for implementing an information distribution campaign for delivering advertising to end users of a data network, wherein identified keywords or phrases of a document are selected for mark-up based, at least in part, upon advertising campaign information provided by an entity other than the end user. In contrast, different embodiments described in the present application disclose various techniques for implementing information distribution campaigns for delivering advertising to end users of a data network, wherein identified keywords or phrases of a document are selected for mark-up based, at least in part, upon advertising campaign information provided by one or more entities other than the end user.

In the office action, the Examiner cited Soulanille as teaching certain elements missing from Milic. However, Soulanille relates to a method for providing a search result list (see, e.g., Abstract and column 4, line 34 to column 5, line 10), and for searching terms based on search requests from the user (see, e.g., column 4, lines 47-53). Neither Milic nor Soulanille appear to teach or suggest (either singly or in combination), the combination of features as defined, for example, in claim 44 of the present application. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 44 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Milic and/or Soulanille.

Independent claims 97 and 150 define features similar to those defined in claim 44 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 44.

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record.

Because claims 44-150 are believed to be allowable in their present form, many of the examiner's rejections in the Office Action have not been addressed in this response. However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicants are not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

It is noted that a proposed telephonic interview has been scheduled with the examiner on Tuesday May 6, 2008, to discuss various aspects relating to the currently pending claims and/or the teachings of the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Dean E. Wolf/

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100

Dean E. Wolf
Reg. No. 37,260